



**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL & TESTING SERVICES**

Project Description: Year 21 Parks, Recreational Facility Improvements- (PCT #1)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: Alcocer Garcia Associates

Date of Evaluation: August 31, 2009

Evaluator's Name: Juan J. Garcia

<b><u>Selection Criteria</u></b>	<b><u>Point</u></b>	<b><u>Score</u></b>
----------------------------------	---------------------	---------------------

1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>19</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: The professional team has demonstrated to be highly qualified in past projects in Hidalgo County.

2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>24</u>
-------------------------------	----	-----------

**\*Note\* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:**

Comments/Rationale for Points: ABADI team members have participated in various projects which in turn equals gained experience.

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>20</u>
---	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Past projects indicate a committed project manager which is readily available and amicable.

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>25</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: ABADI's on site team consultant demonstrated in various past projects directly related a complete understanding of projects as per our field.

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>10</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: ABADI has shown to be compliant with local, state and federal codes and construction methods.

Total Score	<u>98</u>
-------------	-----------

**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL & TESTING SERVICES**

Project Description: Year 21 Parks, Recreational Facility Improvements- (PCT #1)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: Alcocer Garcia Associates

Date of Evaluation: Sept. 4, 2009

Evaluator's Name: Antonio Barco (u.c.p.)

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
---------------------------	--------------	--------------

1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>20</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Very experienced Architects who have successfully completed similar projects in Hidalgo County. Their qualifications are equal or superior to many Architects in the area.

2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>24</u>
-------------------------------	----	-----------

**\*Note\* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:**

Comments/Rationale for Points: Team of Architects have designed many parks projects for Hidalgo County and are very familiar with the locality

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>19</u>
---	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: VAST experience in designing similar projects and historically have made themselves available AT ANY TIME if NEEDED

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>25</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: The team experience should enable them to easily understand the project

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>10</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Very familiar with Rules and Regulation's as they pertain to this project.

Total Score	<u>98</u>
-------------	-----------

**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL & TESTING SERVICES**

Project Description: Year 21 parks, Recreational Facility Improvements- (PCT #1)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: Alcocer Garcia Associates

Date of Evaluation: September 03, 2009

Evaluator's Name: Yvette Islas, Buyer 

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
---------------------------	--------------	--------------

1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>19</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ indicates team has some professional qualities necessary for project.

2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>15</u>
-------------------------------	----	-----------

**\*Note\* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:**

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ indicates experience however unable to reach past clients from all firms being evaluated firms.

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>18</u>
---	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ indicates single point of contact extensive experience, unclear of availability.

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>23</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ unclear of how much experience firm has in this particular type of work.

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>10</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ indicates understanding of rules and regulations

<b>Total Score</b>	<b><u>85</u></b>
--------------------	------------------

**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL & TESTING SERVICES**

Project Description: Year 21 Parks, Recreational Facility Improvements- (PCT #1)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: V.A. Architecture

Date of Evaluation: August 31, 2009

Evaluator's Name: Juan J. Garcia

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>20</u>

Comments/Rationale for Points: V.A. has demonstrated a highly professional and thoroughly qualified team.

2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>24</u>
-------------------------------	----	-----------

**\*Note\* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:**

Comments/Rationale for Points: V.A. has an experienced team with several state certifications. V.A. has completed several projects this past year.

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>18</u>
---	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: V.A. has very experienced project manager.

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>23</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: For project clearly demonstrates V.A.'s understanding of project.

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>9</u>
--	----	----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: V.A. seems to be familiar with all applicable rules and regulations.

**Total Score** 94

**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL & TESTING SERVICES**

Project Description: Year 21 Parks, Recreational Facility Improvements- (PCT #1)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: V.A. Architecture

Date of Evaluation: Sept. 4, 2009

Evaluator's Name: ANTONIO BARCO (UCP)

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
---------------------------	--------------	--------------

1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>20</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Highly professional with strong solid qualifications

2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>24</u>
-------------------------------	----	-----------

**\*Note\* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:**

Comments/Rationale for Points: VAST experience in designing similar projects

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>18</u>
---	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: VAST experience in designing similar projects and should have no problem swatting themselves to the needs of this project.

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>24</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Should have no problem understanding this project because of their experience in similar projects

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>10</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Firm should have no problem knowing all applicable rules and regulations.

Total Score	<u>96</u>
-------------	-----------

**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL & TESTING SERVICES**

Project Description: Year 21 parks, Recreational Facility Improvements- (PCT #1)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: V.A. Architecture

Date of Evaluation: September 03, 2009

Evaluator's Name: Yvette Islas, Buyer 

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
---------------------------	--------------	--------------

1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	20
--	----	----

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ indicates team has professional qualities necessary for this type of project.

2. Experience of Project Team	25	15
-------------------------------	----	----

**\*Note\* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:**

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ indicates experience however unable to reach past clients from all firms being evaluated firms.

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	18
---	----	----

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ indicates single point of contact extensive experience, unclear of availability.

4. Understanding of Project	25	25
-----------------------------	----	----

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ indicates knowledge with relate similar projects

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	10
--	----	----

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ indicates understanding of rules and regulations

SEP 4 2009



<b>Total Score</b>	<b>88</b>
--------------------	-----------

**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL & TESTING SERVICES**

Project Description: Year 21 Parks, Recreational Facility Improvements- (PCT #1)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: ERO Architects

Date of Evaluation: August 31, 2009

Evaluator's Name: Juan J. Garcia

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>19</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: <u>ERO has a very qualified and experienced team from top to bottom. The team is well equipped.</u>		
2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>24</u>
*Note* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:		
Comments/Rationale for Points: <u>will professional with up to 35 yrs experience. ERO has demonstrated a top level project team.</u>		
3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>19</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: <u>ERO has an extremely experienced project manager.</u>		
4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>23</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: <u>Upon reviewing ERO no past project was in the statement of qualifications.</u>		
5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>9</u>
Comments/Rationale for Points: <u>ERO has demonstrated a familiarity with all rules and regulations to complete project.</u>		
<b>Total Score</b>		<u>94</u>

**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL & TESTING SERVICES**

Project Description: Year 21 Parks, Recreational Facility Improvements- (PCT #1)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: ERO Architects

Date of Evaluation: Sept. 4, 2009

Evaluator's Name: Antonio Barco (UCP)

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
---------------------------	--------------	--------------

1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>30</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Highly Qualified with Outstanding Credentials as per statement of qualifications

2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>34</u>
-------------------------------	----	-----------

**\*Note\* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:**

Comments/Rationale for Points: TEAM is highly experienced but most of their work has been designing buildings and public facilities

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>17</u>
---	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: This is a Reputable Firm and should be able to Avail themselves to the project.

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>34</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Should have no difficulty understanding project based on their credentials

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>10</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: Will have no problem understanding Applicable Rates and Regulation

Total Score	<u>95</u>
-------------	-----------


**HIDALGO COUNTY STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATION  
SCORING/EVALUATION SHEET  
ENGINEERING/ARCHITECTURAL & TESTING SERVICES**

Project Description: Year 21 parks, Recreational Facility Improvements- (PCT #1)

Department: Hidalgo County Urban County Program

Name of Firm: ERO Architects

Date of Evaluation: September 03, 2009

Evaluator's Name: Yvette Islas, Buyer 

<u>Selection Criteria</u>	<u>Point</u>	<u>Score</u>
---------------------------	--------------	--------------

1. Professional Qualifications of Team	20	<u>18</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ indicates team has extensive professional qualities.

2. Experience of Project Team	25	<u>15</u>
-------------------------------	----	-----------

**\*Note\* Information necessary to assess the firm on this criteria should be gathered by contacting past/current clients:**

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ indicates experience however unable to reach past clients from all firms being evaluated firms.

3. Experience/Availability of Project Manager	20	<u>18</u>
---	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ indicates single point of contact extensive experience, unclear of availability.

4. Understanding of Project	25	<u>25</u>
-----------------------------	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ indicates team's experience strong and very capable of understanding this type of project.

5. Familiarity with Applicable Rules and Regulations	10	<u>10</u>
--	----	-----------

Comments/Rationale for Points: SOQ indicates understanding of rules and regulations

<b>Total Score</b>	<u><b>86</b></u>
--------------------	------------------